(4)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH

Writ Petition No. 3360 / 2006

Petitioner

Smt. Rajbala Guru 46 Yrs
w/o P.K. Sullerey
R/o Q.No. 3B, Street 24,
Sector 10, Bhilai, Durg

P.R. No. 3418/06
Presented by Shri Rajya Shree
dated 7/7/06

VERSUS

Respondent

1. State of Chhattisgarh,
Through: Secretary,
Deptt. of Higher Edu,
DKS Bhawan,
Mantralaya, Raipur
2. Smt. Premlata Mishra
Age & w/o not known
Presently Asst. Professor
at Govt. College,
Abhanpur, Distt. Raipur
3. Smt. Sarita Swami
Age & w/o not known
Presently Asst. Professor
at Govt. College,
Arjunda, Distt. Durg

RECEIVED-COPY
CLERK TO ADVOCATE BILASPUR
7/7/06

WRIT PETITION U/A. 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.3360/ **सन्** 200 6

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	11-7-2006 Mr. Raja Sharma, counsel for the petitioner. Miss Deepali Pandey, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondent No.1, on advance copy. Heard. By this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has questioned the propriety and legality of the order dated 30-6-2006 (Annexure P-1), whereby the petitioner has been transferred from Utai to Arjunda. The main grievance of the petitioner is that the impugned transfer has been made in order to accommodate respondent No.2 who has opted for posting at Utai and to accommodate respondent No.3 who has opted to leave Arjunda. The petitioner's daughter is studying in Class-X at Bhilai and her husband is employed at Bhilai Steel Plant, therefore, by the impugned transfer her whole family will be adversely affected. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that husband of the petitioner is working at Bhilai Steel Plant and on account of the impugned transfer, her family will be separated. He also argued that one post is already lying vacant in the same College from where the petitioner has been transferred and therefore, respondent No.1 could have accommodated respondent No.2 on that post. Therefore, the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to respondent No.1 raising all these grievances and respondent No.1 be directed to decide the same, to which learned counsel appearing for the State/respondent No.1 has no objection.	

(पीछे देखिये)

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.3360/ **सन्** 2006 (61)

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित - 2 -	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	Having heard learned counsel for the parties, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and without expressing any opinion on merit of the case, the request made by learned counsel for the petitioner is just, fair and reasonable. Therefore, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation raising all her grievances annexing a copy of the writ petition to respondent No.1 within ten days from today and respondent No.1 is directed to decide the representation within one month from the date of its receipt after considering the points raised by the petitioner, in an objective manner, in accordance with law. With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Consequently, M.(W.)P.No.2586/2006 also stands disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. Sd/- L.C. Bhadoo Judge	

Soma

(पीछे देखिये)

12.7.06